R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 473 CG 000 930

SCHOOL AND FAMILY BACKGROUND CORRELATES OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ANXIETY.

BY- DUNN, JAMES A.
MICHIGAN UNIV., ANN ARBOR, MIDWEST RESEARCH CTR.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 53P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS, *STUDENT ATTITUDES, *PERFORMANCE, ANXIETY, FAMILY BACKGROUND, MENTAL HEALTH, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, STUDENT ADJUSTMENT, PEER RELATIONSHIP, *STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, *RESEARCH PROJECTS, PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS, HARRIS GOODENOUGH DRAW A MAN TEST, SARASON TEST ANXIETY SCALE FOR CHILDREN

A STUDY WAS MADE OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS TO (1) THEIR INTELLECTUAL, ACADEMIC, AND SOCIAL PERFORMANCE AND (2) CERTAIN FAMILY, SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY BACKGROUND VARIABLES. LITERATURE PERTINENT TO THE PROBLEM IS REVIEWED. THE SAMPLE CONSISTED OF 400 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS. GROUP INTELLIGENCE TESTS, AN ACHIEVEMENT TEST, THE GOODENOUGH DRAW-A-MAN TEST, A PEER RATING, A REVISED FORM OF SARASON'S TEST ANXIETY SCALE FOR CHILDREN, CUMULATIVE RECORD INFORMATION, AND A MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT SCHOOL ATTITUDES, PERCEPTION OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, AND PERSONAL AFFECT WERE USED. A PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION MATRIX WAS GENERATED FOR 40 CASES. THE GENERAL EMOTIONAL TONE OF THE CLASSROOM IS RELATED TO THE AFFECTIVE IMAGE OF THE TEACHER AS PERCEIVED BY THE CHILD. PERSONAL AFFECT STATES SEEM MORE INVOLVED WITH TEACHER-PEER RELATIONSHIPS THAN WITH PERSONAL AND FAMILY BACKGROUND FACTORS. GREATER ATTENTION SHOULD BE PAID TO TEACHER-PUPIL AND PUPIL-PUPIL INTERACTION, AND TO THE CLASSROOM CLIMATE. THIS DOCUMENT APPEARED AS STUDY 6 IN SCHOOL ANXIETY AND COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING/ EXPLORATORY STUDIES, REPORT 4, IRCOPPS MIDWEST RESEARCH CENTER FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, PP. 165-211. (FS)

ED013473

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERPROFESSIONAL

RESEARCH

COMMISSION

ON

PUPIL

PERSONNEL

SERVICES

Midwest Research Center

SCHOOL ANXIETY AND COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING: EXPLORATORY STUDIES

University of Michigan

CG 000 930

IRCOPPS MIDWEST RESEARCH CENTER
FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

SCHOOL ANXIETY AND COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING: EXPLORATORY STUDIES

James Dunn
Philip Safford
Ruth Schelkun
Roger Scott
Patricia Shanks

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
1967

MIDWEST RESEARCH CENTER FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICE

July 1967

DIRECTOR
JAMES A. DUNN, PH.D.

STAFF ASSOCIATES
ESTHER L. BELCHER MA
JONAN W. ELIOT, MD, MPH
ROBERT B. FOX, MA, ED D
WARREN A. KETCHAM, PH D
ELTON B. MCNEIL, PH.D
FRANK F. MAPLE, MA, MSW
DICK E. MORLEY, PH.D
WILLIAM C MORSE, PH D
VIRGINIA SYAGE, PH.D
ROBERT W. DIXON, PH.D
GERALDINE C. SCHOLL, PH D
JULES SCHRAGER, AB, MSW
LAWRENCE E. SOUSA, MS, PH
MARY M. TAYLOR, MSW
GARRY A. WALZ, MA, PH D
JACK C. WESTMAN, M.D. MD

PREFACE

This report is the fourth in a series of research monographs published by the IRCOPPS Midwest Research Center. A survey of Center activities plus a comprehensive synopsis of the Center's project reports may be found in the Center's 1967 Summary Status Report.

The present monograph reports the results of eight modular pilot studies conducted by various center staff. All research was supported by NIMH Grant #01428. Several of the studies have been presented, in abbreviated form, at various professional meetings and certain of the results have already appeared, or are due to appear, as short published articles.

Appreciation is expressed to the various staff associated with the production of these reports.

James A. Dunn
Director
IRCOPPS
Midwest Research Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STUDY I	CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH SCHOOL ANXIETY, By James A. Dunn and Patricia F. Shanks	1
STUDY II	A NEW LOOK AT THE EFFECTS OF ANXIETY AND STRESS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF COMPLEX INTELLECTUAL TASKS, By James A. Dunn	102
STUDY III	THE PREDICTION OF CREATIVITY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FROM A CONCRETE PERCEPTUAL-COGNITIVE TASK, By Philip L. Safford	122
STUDY IV	AGE, SEX, AND IQ DIFFERENCES IN PERFORMANCE ON A CONCRETE PERCEPTUAL-COGNITIVE TASK, By Philip L. Safford and James A. Dunn	131
STUDY V	DECREMENT IN CHILDREN'S COGNITIVE PERFORMANCE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF INFORMATION OVERLOAD, By Roger O. Scott	141
STUDY VI	SCHOOL AND FAMILY BACKGROUND CORRELATES OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ANXIETY, By James A. Dunn	165
STUDY VII	THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE NEW HARRIS-GOODENOUGH DRAW-A-MAN TEST, By James A. Dunn	212
STUDY VIII	SCHOOL ANXIETY AND THE FACILITATION OF PERFORMANCE, By Ruth F. Schelkun and James A. Dunn	223

STUDY VI

SCHOOL AND FAMILY BACKGROUND CORRELATES OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ANXIETY

JAMES A. DUNN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Problem 167

Literature 168

Hypotheses 179

Methodology 180

Results and Discussion 189

References 193

Appendix A - Correlation Matrix 197

Appendix B - Instrumentation 200

One segment of educational research is concerned with the ways in which various intra- and interpersonal factors affect children's adjustment and performance in school. The variables which have been investigated are numerous and cover a wide range of situational and personal conditions.

Schools have long taken the intellectual and physical abilities of children into consideration in designing educational programs. In recent years efforts have been turned toward the investigation of the effects of emotional and attitudinal factors on children's learning. A number of school systems now attempt to improve their educational programs by taking such factors into consideration. California, for example, has been actively engaged in such a state-wide program since 1957.

One assumption underlying this approach is that if a child is not learning at a level commensurate with his ability, a variety of factors may be responsible. In addition to physical handicaps such as poor vision or hearing, it has seemed reasonable to speculate that lack of optimum achievement could also be due to poor school attitude, a strong dislike of certain curriculum areas, worry or concern over social popularity,

test anxiety and the like. Educational research is undertaken on the strength of the conviction that once one understands basic relationships, attempts may be made at optimizing educational procedures.

A mental health orientation places particular emphasis on possible relationships such as those mentioned above. The concept of hygienic school practices, as opposed to those which may be detrimental to the mental health of pupils or which fail to maximally benefit the individual child (and therefore society), has suggested several fruitful areas for research.

PROBLEM

The present study represents an attempt to measure the relationships which may exist between children's school adjustment, achievement, personality development, family background, social relationships and the like. The dimensions studied do not represent an exhaustive list of those which might have been considered. Those which were selected were thought to represent, from a mental health standpoint, areas of prime concern.

The intent of the study was not to investigate relatively acute instances of disturbance or dysfunction, as is typically

the case; rather it was to investigate the more or less normal child and the ordinary, chronic, day to day pressures to which children are subjected in their everyday school-home-community life.

In general, the study was aimed at the investigation of two major problem areas:

1. The relationship of children's school mental health problems to their intellectual, academic, and social performance.
2. The relationship of those mental health problems to certain family, school, and community background variables.

LITERATURE

Personal and Family Background Factors

Much research has been devoted to the study of the differential effects of various socioeconomic aspects of the child's background upon his success in school. This research has characteristically investigated molar indices, e.g., drop-out rates, incidence of truancy, etc. (Ullman, 1952), although some studies have specified a more discrete psychological measure of school adjustment, such as anxiety (Davidson, 1959), or need for achievement (Veroff, Wilcox, & Atkinson, 1953). The latter types

of studies represent attempts to identify the characteristic effects of socioeconomic factors on individuals in psychological terms.

Sarason, et al. (1960) found anxiety unrelated to social class when occupational level of the father was used as the index. However, when educational level of parents was used as the criterion, greater incidence of high-anxiety was found among children of less well-educated parents. Further, greater disparity in educational levels of mother and father was correlated with high anxiety in boys. Finally, a greater incidence of working mothers was found among boys with high test anxiety, indicating that it may be the by-products of socioeconomic status which influences anxiety, rather than the fact of socioeconomic level itself.

The work of Miller and Swanson (1960) marks an attempt to demonstrate differential effects of child-management techniques, e.g., discipline, on the utilization of mechanisms employed to defend against anxiety. Again, discipline techniques were seen to be a by-product of socioeconomic factors. Physical punishment was found to be more prevalent among lower-class families than middle class families, and to give rise to more primitive defenses, such as projection and denial. Among middle-class families, "psychological" discipline was found to

be reflected in the utilization of defenses geared more to placation and expiation.

Bandura and Walters (1959) have suggested that the lack of relatability frequently noted in aggressively antisocial or asocial boys, might be related to affectional deprivation during infancy, which is thought to be more characteristic of lower-class families than of middle-class. In their words, ". . .absence of affectional dependent behavior either may spring from antisocial failure to develop emotional responsiveness to others or may represent an inhibition of dependency behavior because of the anxiety which its expression arouses." (1959; p. 35)

Findings by Morse, Bloom, & Dunn (1961), Phillips (1966), and Feld (1965) suggest that school anxiety may be more prevalent among lower-class children than their middle-class peers.

The Sarason studies also suggest relationships between expression of anxiety and sex; girls respond positively to questions about anxiety much more frequently than boys. (1960) This is in marked contrast to the much greater frequencies of truancy, admission to psychiatric treatment facilities, placement in special classes, and identification as behavior problems among boys. Both are thought to be manifestations of

"social desirability" phenomena. Certain types of behavior are accepted to a greater degree in girls than in boys, and vice versa. Our culture imposes certain sex-role expectations, which are thought to account for many of the above discrepancies (Sarason, 1960).

Chronological age has been found to play a role in school adjustment as well. The classic studies of Jersild (1933, 1949), demonstrate a marked decline of educational morale with age. Morale is at its lowest point during the junior high school years, accompanied, presumably, by the greatest incidence of maladjusted behavior.

The role of the particular school attended is thought to be influenced most markedly by socioeconomic factors, which would determine at least the peer associations a child would have. However, some studies have indicated positive effects of mental health-oriented programming in individual schools (Bisgyer & Kahn, 1964; Knoblock & Garcea, 1965).

The question of the effects of sibship ordering on a child's school adjustment is largely open to speculation. Some psychological theoretical systems, especially that of Adler, have dealt extensively with this variable (1927). Other psychoanalytic assumptions would give rise to many speculations concerning the influence on personality of sib-

ship ordering and number of siblings (Freud, 1936).

Pupil School Attitude Factors

That how a child perceives school, *in toto*, will have some degree of influence on his achievement and adjustment in school seems obvious. Much psychological research has been concerned with various aspects of pupil attitude (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957).

The interaction of such factors as socioeconomic level with attitude toward school has often been suggested (Getzels, 1964).

Attitudes toward school has been given a major focus in much of the therapeutic educational work with emotionally disturbed children (Berkowitz & Rothman, 1960; Devereaux, 1956; Pearson, 1954).

Particular programs, such as "Project Re-ed" (Hobbs, 1965) emphasize the development of more positive school attitudes, while others (Cruickshank, *et al.*, 1961; Haring and Phillips, 1962) seek to impose environmental conditions which interfere with undesirable patterns of behavior, thus permitting the growth of new patterns.

Redl and Wineman (1957) have described at length their attempts to enable "Children who Hate" to modify their atti-

tudes toward life.

Erickson (1950) has discussed the necessity of a child's forming early patterns of trust in order to achieve desirable adjustment in adult life.

It is expected, therefore, that the adjustment achieved by a child in school will be in great part a function of the way he perceives school and what happens in it. Consequently, even more important than an "objective" measure of such a factor as "degree of classroom individualized instruction," for example, would be the child's own subjective view of the degree of individual help he, or his classmates, receive.

School Anxiety

The appropriateness of the concept of anxiety in considering a child's school achievement and adjustment is almost consensus. There is much less agreement, however, regarding the definition, etiology, and effects of anxiety (Ruebush, 1963).

Anxiety research with children in the schools, in recent years, has typically employed one or the other of two instruments.

The concept of anxiety as a drive or drive-related construct was reflected in the construction of the Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS, Taylor, 1953). The children's form, the CMAS (Castaneda, et al., 1956) is an adaptation of this in-

strument for use with children. Castaneda, et al. expressed belief that the descriptive and normative data for the instrument had established its usefulness "for measuring the level of drive with the immediate purpose of attempting to determine its role as a determinant of performance in children." (Castaneda, et al., 1956: 326). According to Ruebush (1963: 475) the CMAS is, by definition, ". . . a measure of the child's tendency to experience a general and chronic state of anxiety, rather than of a tendency to experience anxiety only in specific situations or as a process or transitory phenomenon." From this assumption, hypotheses regarding the debilitating or facilitating effects of anxiety on performance have been generated on the basis of task and intrapersonal variables, such as task difficulty or complexity, intellectual level, etc. (Castaneda, et al., 1956; Rowley and Keller, 1962; Phillips, et al., 1959).

Levy (1961) noted the pronounced increment in incidence of anxiety studies corresponding to the introduction, first of the MAS and subsequently of the CMAS. Much research has apparently been generated as a result of the availability of these instruments.

A differing orientation to the problem of anxiety study

is reflected in the work of Sarason and his associates at Yale University. Seeing this area from a psychoanalytic point of reference, Sarason, et al. designed two measures of children's anxiety, the TASC and GASC, as well as an earlier inventory appropriate for research with college-age and adult subjects, the TAQ (Mandler and Sarason, 1952). Detailed and comprehensive discussion of the origins of the TASC and GASC and their standardization, the culmination of six years of intensive team research, was provided in the report, Anxiety in Elementary School Children (Sarason, et al., 1960).

As Ruebush (1963) pointed out, anxiety need not be considered a unitary, monolithic phenomenon. One appropriate avenue of research would be to pursue more specific, situationally-defined types of anxiety. This was the initial approach of Sarason and his co-workers who chose to focus on children's test anxiety. Sarason, et al. felt that, because of the great importance and near-universality of the testing situation in our culture, test anxiety was an eminently appropriate area for study (Sarason, et al., 1960).

Sarason's Test Anxiety Scale for Children (TASC) consists of a series of questions regarding subjective reactions specific to test situations in school. His General Anxiety Scale for Children (GASC) consists of items relating to various

situations.

In their validation attempts the authors wished to ascertain the degree of construct validity the scales possessed, using the criterion of prediction. As a consequence, each of the many studies conducted by Sarason and his group was seen as contributing to the validating evidence for the construct, in this case anxiety, an inferred construct generated from a psychoanalytic theoretical frame of reference.

Reliability coefficients obtained for both the TASC and GASC indicate adequate internal consistency and, within some time limitations, a satisfactory degree of test-retest reliability. (Sarason, et al., 1960).

Goodenough Draw-A-Man

Attempts to use the drawings of children as indices of intellectual growth received an impetus with the publication in 1926 by Florence Goodenough of the Draw-A-Man Test (1926). Since that time use of the test has been widespread, particularly in intelligence testing of young children in the schools. According to a recent survey by Sundberg (1961) it was second only to the Wechsler-Bellevue in frequency of use.

The revision of this instrument in 1963 by Dale B. Harris marked the first revision of the test after more than 35 years

of use (1963). The intent of the Harris revision was to provide a more extensive and more objective scoring system; to employ the concept of deviation I.Q., rather than mental age I.Q.; and to develop a Draw-A-Woman measure as an alternate form.

Harris felt that in view of the altered views as to the nature of intelligence which had been expressed since the development of the measure, the revision was further justified. Considering concept formation an index of intellectual maturity, he hypothesized that a child's drawing reveals his ability to discriminate an object as a concept, i.e., as belonging to a class. Therefore, the concept of a frequently experienced object, a human being, was thought to provide a useful index of level of maturity. (Harris, 1963).

Other writers, such as Lowenfeld (1952), have placed great stress on the "functional-motoric" aspects of developing concept formation in children. Kephart (1960) has in part based a theory of educational remediation for intellectually and neurologically impaired children on the hypothesis that the formation of concepts at the motor level is necessary for normal development.

Pupil School-Adjustment Factors

Bower (1960) describes the emotionally handicapped child as one lacking in freedom to adapt to varying demands of the situation. His choices as to possible kind of behavior are restricted. Five patterns of maladjustive behavior are seen as reflecting this loss of freedom:

1. An inability to learn which cannot be adequately explained by intellectual, sensory, neuro-physiological, or general health factors.
2. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers.
3. Inappropriate or immature types of behavior or feelings under normal conditions.
4. A general, pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression.
5. A tendency to develop physical symptoms, such as speech problems, pains, or fears, associated with personal or school problems. (Bower & Lambert, 1961, p. 2).

One review of the Bower and Lambert screening process questioned the authors' assumptions that, once emotionally handicapped children were identified, schools would then be able to take positive ameliorative steps (Ross, 1965).

Since the famous Wickman study (1928) many workers have attempted to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of various indicators of adjustment and maladjustment in school. (Ullman, 1952; Rogers, 1931). Studies using multiple indices, that is, those using ratings by teachers, peers, and self, rather than only one index, have proven to be most useful.

The goal of a screening process, such as the Bower and Lambert procedure, is early identification which, hopefully, will lead to specific steps to alleviate adjustment problems. The ultimate goal is, of course, prevention. (Bower, 1960). Such procedures and goals make several assumptions about the nature and effects of emotional disturbances. These include the beliefs that: early detection affords the best chance for amelioration (since young children are presumably more amenable to change than are adolescents or adults) and that interpersonal child-adult and child-peer interactions play a vital role in personality formation (Bower, 1961: 8).

HYPOTHESES

In general, then, a number of expectations were entertained.

First, regarding personal and family background variables, it was expected that:

a) measures of various aspects of school anxiety (i.e., test anxiety, recitation anxiety and general school anxiety) were expected to correlate with each other;

b) anxiety was expected to correlate negatively with measures of educational achievement;

c) anxiety was expected to correlate negatively with perceptions of teacher's supportiveness; and

d) anxiety was expected to correlate with teacher peer ratings.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Data were obtained from elementary school pupils in an upper-middle class suburb of a major metropolitan area. Total school population was approximately 5000 pupils. The sample was 400 pupils randomly selected from the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades.

Instrumentation

Verbal and non-verbal I.Q. and academic achievement scores were obtained routinely in the school system.

The California Test of Mental Maturity was used for children in grade 3, and the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test was used for grades 4, 5, and 6.

The California Test of Mental Maturity (California Test Bureau, 1957 ed.) yields a profile showing a mental age in each of the separate subtests in eight general areas: memory, spatial relationships, logical reasoning, numerical reasoning, verbal concepts, total language factors, and total non-language factors. An I.Q. score for language and for non-language factors is obtained by dividing the earned MA score by chronological age.

The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence verbal battery includes subtests in Sentence Completion, Verbal Classification, Arithmetical Reasoning, and Vocabulary. The Non-verbal subtests are Figure Classification, Number Series, and Figure Analogies, based on pictorial, numerical, and diagrammatic content.

The Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Houghton-Mifflin, 1956) was used at all grade levels. This battery yields a total of 15 separate scores over: vocabulary, reading comprehension, language (5 scores), arithmetic skills (3 scores), work-study skills (4 scores), and total score. Only reading comprehension and arithmetic skills were used in the present study, however.

The Goodenough Draw-A-Man Test was group administered to all subjects. Raw scores were translated into deviation I.Q. scores, following the revised scoring procedure outlined in Harris (1963). In addition, scores on several clinical

dimensions were tabulated, following a point scale procedure. These were: size of figure, embellishment, action in drawing, hostility, and erasure. Each were thought to provide an indication of some feature of the child's performance interpretable in clinical terms. Size and embellishment would suggest expansiveness, as opposed to constricted performance. Action in the drawing would suggest more creativity than is seen in a static drawing, and hostility in the action is evaluated according to the themes which are found. Erasure, suggesting a possible lack of confidence in one's ability to produce the figure or fear, for example, of disclosure, might be thought of as a reflection of anxiety. Validity of such uses of the Goodenough Test has yet to be determined (Harris, 1963); however, it was felt that the present investigation might provide an opportunity for further investigation of the usability of the task in the measurement of variables other than "intelligence" through observations of correlations with other measures.

Section 1 of "A Class Play," (Bower and Lambert, 1961) the portion which calls for ratings of children by their peers, was also administered to all subjects. The instructions for Section 1 of "A Class Play" are: "On the line next to each part, write the name of either a boy or girl who you think

could best play the part." The "parts" include: A true friend; a mean, cruel boss; a school nurse or doctor; a very lazy person; etc.

A total peer-rating score for each pupil is obtained by tallying the number of times he is chosen for each role, summed across roles. A total score for selection on even-numbered roles (negatively-toned descriptions) was also tabulated so that the percentage of negative selections in relationship to total number of selections could be calculated. High percentage scores indicate a high degree of negative perception of a pupil by his peers.

In addition to total peer rating score, total negative rating, and percentage of negative ratings, a score for Item 2 of the inventory was separately recorded. This item is worded as follows: "Somebody who is often afraid and who acts like a little boy or girl."

"Behavior Ratings of Pupils," also a part of the procedure developed by Bower and Lambert (1961), was employed in order to obtain ratings of the children by their teachers. In this procedure, the teacher is asked to rate all pupils in her class on the degree to which they resemble eight separate descriptions. Examples of these descriptions are: This pupil gets into fights or quarrels with other pupils more often than others; this

pupil makes unusual or inappropriate responses during normal school activities; his behavior is unpredictable; etc. Other items involve peer interaction, learning difficulty, exclusive attention to school work, tendency to endanger or frighten self or others, depression and inattention, and emotional or somatic responses to difficult situations. Seven categories from "least like" to "most like" are possible, and teachers are asked to include all pupils on the continuum for each description, in pyramidal fashion, allowing most pupils to fall into the intermediate categories. The total score of a pupil for each description is tabulated and the totals are summed, yielding an overall score for the teacher's rating of the school adjustment of a pupil. A high score indicates poor adjustment, a low score reflecting comparatively good adjustment as perceived by the teacher.

A revised form of Sarason's Test Anxiety Scale for Children was administered to all subjects and the total score was recorded. Dunn (1964) found that factors relating to generalized school anxiety and recitation anxiety, taken together, comprise about one-half the factor structure of the TASC, the other one-half (after deletion of factorially irrelevant items) consisting of items relating specifically to test anxiety. Consequently, separate scores for test anxiety, recitation anxiety, and

general school anxiety were obtained for each child, as well as the total TASC score.

Variables relating to pupil school attitude, pupil's perception of classroom management, and personal affect, specifically school anxiety, were investigated via a multiple choice pupil questionnaire developed by Morse, Bloom, and Dunn (1961). The basic instrument was revised, pilot tested, and factor analyzed prior to administration to all subjects in the present study as a three-part questionnaire, (See appendix) the third part of which comprised 27 items from the Test Anxiety Scale for Children.

Parts I and II comprise 48 items which have been factored into six discrete areas, each yielding a total score recorded for each pupil. These are:

1. Positive affect for school.
2. Pupil's school achievement orientation.
3. Degree of individualized instruction in the classroom as perceived by the pupil.
4. Pupil's report of degree of difficulty he experiences in his school work.
5. Perceived interpersonal affect in the class.
6. Pupil's perception of the teacher as a supportive individual, or fulfilling a supportive role.

Part I of the questionnaire asks pupils to respond to questions on a five point scale (never, seldom, sometimes, most of the time, almost always) such as, "How often do you like your school work?" (achievement orientation). In Part II, pupils choose one of five alternatives to complete statements such as, "I like _____(almost, none, a few, some, most, almost all) of my classmates." (interpersonal affect), or choose one of five such alternatives to answer a question, e.g., "How much do teachers remind you of people who make you feel important?" (teacher supportiveness).

Other data for the study were obtained from pupils' cumulative record folders. In addition to pupil identification, age, grade, and sex, these data included information relevant to personal and family background variables. These were level of educational attainment of father and mother, number of siblings, and number of older siblings.

In summary then, the variables under consideration were:

1) age
2) sex
3) grade
4) educational level of mother
5) educational level of father

6) number of siblings

7) sibling order

8) positive affect for school

9) positive achievement orientation

10) child's perception of teacher's allowance for individual differences in the classroom

11) child's perceptions of teacher's supportiveness

12) child's perceptions of interpersonal classroom affect

13) test anxiety

14) recitation anxiety

15) general school anxiety

16) IQ

17) reading comprehension

18) arithmetic skills

19) verbal IQ

20) non-verbal IQ

21) Goodenough Draw-A-Man IQ

22) teacher ratings of pupil adjustment

23) peer ratings of pupil adjustment

24) clinical measures of anxiety and hostility as derived from human figure drawing interpretations

a) the educational level of a child's parents would correlate with his achievement orientation and his general school attitude (i.e. positive affect towards school);

b) a child's educational achievement (reading and arithmetic) and school adjustment (general school anxiety) would be related to the number of children in the family, and to the child's sib-order;

c) a child's educational achievement and school adjustment would be related to ability, as indicated by IQ scores; and

d) some relationship between sex and attitude towards school and level of academic achievement would be found.

Second, regarding subjective perceptions of, and attitudes toward, school:

a) a positive relationship was expected between attitudes toward school and educational achievement; and

b) general positive school attitude was expected to correlate with perceptions of the teacher as a supportive person.

Third, regarding school anxiety:

Data Analysis

A random sample of 40 cases was drawn from the total sample of 400 children in order to facilitate data analysis. The principle analysis procedure was correlation. A Pearson product-moment correlation matrix was generated on the University of Michigan IBM 7090.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The total correlation matrix is attached to the end of this report.

In general little justification was found for the *a priori* expectancies. Mother and father's education, number of siblings in the family, sibling order, and sex had practically nothing to do with academic achievement, affect for school, positive school adjustment, or the child's general achievement orientation. As might be expected, verbal IQ correlated significantly (in the .46 to .64 range) with academic achievement. There was a tendency for a negative correlation (-.25) between IQ and school adjustment as measured by general school anxiety. General school anxiety did correlate -.30, however, with reading comprehension, -.29 with arithmetic, -.33 with perception of teacher supportiveness, and -.33 with peer ratings. Teacher supportiveness correlated .50 with general school attitude,

i.e., positive affect for school.

Thus, it would appear that roughly 50% of the general a priori expectations were reasonable to entertain. An increase in the number of cases analyzed would decrease the level required for statistical significance; however, it would not increase the actual size of the correlation coefficients. In view of the relatively small size of the coefficients comprising the matrix, larger scale data analysis was not pursued.

A number of very interesting results were generated by the present matrix. These are summarized in Table 1. In general it can be noticed that a child's positive orientation towards school i.e., the degree to which he claims to like school, is related to the degree of teacher supportiveness perceived by the child and also the degree of interpersonal affect perceived as present in the classroom. It is negatively related to degree of perceived work difficulty and degree of anxiety experienced in recitation settings. In other words those children who perceive classwork as difficult, and who experience a high degree of anxiety during recitation sessions, have little positive affect for school. The level of difficulty of class work for a given child correlates .40 with general school anxiety and .43 for recitation anxiety. Perception of work difficulty has nothing whatsoever to do with a child's IQ, however. Thus it is not necessarily children of low intellectual ability who dislike

school and report classwork as being difficult for them.

It also appears that there is an intimate relationship between the degree to which the teacher is perceived as a supportive individual in the classroom and the degree to which a high degree of interpersonal affect is present in the peer group. Teacher supportiveness also appears to be related to the degree which a child perceives the teacher as providing individual help when needed ($r = .41$).

In view of these results, it would appear that the general emotional tone of the classroom is intimately related to the affective image of the teacher as perceived by the child. This is not to argue that the teacher sets the affect tone of the classroom, for to do so would be to interpret causality from co-variate analysis, which is not possible. The data do suggest, however, that even such relatively personal affect states as anxiety, at least as far as school relevant dimensions are concerned, is much more intimately involved with teacher-peer relationships in the classroom than with personal and family background factors.

These findings suggest that if one is interested in the amelioration of children's school anxiety, it might be entirely appropriate to concentrate much greater attention on the dynamics of teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction and on the management of the classroom climate than has heretofore been the case.

TABLE 1

Selected Correlations

	Difficulty of Work	Interpersonal Affect	Teacher Supportiveness	General School Anxiety	Recitation Anxiety	Achievement Orientation	ID	IQ
Affect for School	-.49	.36	.50	-.33	-.42	.29	.21	.15
Difficulty of Work	X	-.17	-.26	.40	.43	-.17	.06	.02
Interpersonal Affect		X	.62	-.16	-.15	.37	.32	-.06
Teacher Supportiveness			X	-.33	-.35	.37	.41	.04
General School Anxiety				X	.69	-.02	-.15	-.25
Recitation Anxiety					X	-.17	-.16	-.07
Achievement Orientation						X	-.03	.00
Individual Instruction							X	-.14
IQ								

REFERENCES

Adler, A. Practice and theory of individual psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1927.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.

Berkowitz, Pearl H. & Rothman, Esther P. The disturbed child: recognition and psychoeducational therapy in the classroom. New York: New York Univer. Press, 1960.

Bisgyer, J. H., Kahn, C. L., & Frazee, V. F. Special classes for emotionally disturbed children. Amer. J. of Ortho-psychiatry, 1964, 34, 696-704.

Bower, E. M. Early identification of emotionally handicapped children in school. Springfield: Thomas, 1960.

Bower, E. M. & Lambert, Nadine M. A process for in-school screening of children with emotional handicaps. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1961.

California test of mental maturity. California Test Bureau, 1957.

Castaneda, A., McCandless, B. R., & Palermo, D. S. The children's form of the manifest anxiety scale. Child Develpm., 1956, 27, 317-326.

Cruickshank, W., et al. A teaching method for brain injured and hyperactive children. Syracuse: Syracuse Univer. Press, 1961.

Davidson, K. S. Interviews of parents of high anxious and low anxious children. Child Develpm., 1959, 30, 341-351.

Devereaux, G. Therapeutic education: its theoretical basis and practice. New York: Harper, 1956.

Dunn, J. A. Factor structure of the test anxiety scale for children. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 29, 92.

Erickson, E. Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Feld, Sheila. Personal communication to J. Dunn, 1965.

Freud, S. Inhibitions, symptoms, and anxieties. London: Hogarth Press, 1936.

Getzels, J. W. Learning to learn and the education of the lower-class urban child. Amer. J. of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 326-327.

Haring, N. G. & Phillips, E. L. Educating emotionally disturbed children. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Harris, D. B. Children's drawings as measures of intellectual maturity. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963.

Hobbs, N. How the re-ed plan developed. In Long, N., Morse, W. C., & Newman, Ruth G. (Eds.), Conflict in the classroom: the education of the emotionally disturbed child. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1965.

Iowa test of basic skills. Houghton-Mifflin, 1956.

Jersild, A. T., Markey, Frances V., & Jersild, Catherine L. Children's fears, dreams, wishes, daydreams, likes, dislikes, pleasant and unpleasant memories. New York: Columbia University, 1933.

Jersild, A. T. & Tasch, Ruth J. Children's interests and what they suggest for education. New York: Columbia University, 1949.

Kephart, N. C. The slow learner in the classroom. Columbus: Merrill, 1960.

Knoblock, P. & Garcea, R. A. Inward and broader concept of the role of the special class for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Child, 1965, 31, 329-337.

Levy, L. H. Anxiety and behavior scientists' behavior. Amer. Psychol., 1961, 16, 66-68.

Lorge-Thorndike intelligence test. Houghton-Mifflin, 1954.

Lowenfeld, V. Creative and mental growth. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Mandler, G. & Sarason, S. B. A study of anxiety and learning. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 166-173.

Miller, D. R. & Swanson, G. R. Inner conflict and defense. New York: Holt, 1960.

Miller, N. E. & Dollard, J. Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Morse, W. C., Bloom, R., & Dunn, J. A. A study of school classroom behavior from diverse evaluative frameworks: developmental, mental health, substantive learning, group process. Research Monograph, Univer. of Mich., 1961.

Pearson, G. H. Psychoanalysis and the education of the child. New York: Norton, 1954.

Phillips, B. N. An analysis of causes of anxiety among children in school. Under Project No. 2616/USOE Grant No. OE-5-10-012, 1966.

Phillips, B. N., King, F. J., & McGuire, C. Studies in anxiety: anxiety performance on psychometric tests varying in complexity. Child Developm., 1959, 30, 253-260.

Redl, F. & Wineman, D. The aggressive child. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Rogers, C. R. Measuring personality adjustment in children nine to thirteen years of age. New York: Columbia University, 1931.

Ross, A. O. Process for in-school screening of children with emotional handicaps. In Buros, O. K. (Ed.) The 6th mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965, pp. 356-357.

Rowley, V. & Keller, E. D. Changes in children's verbal behavior as a function of social approval and manifest anxiety. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1962, 65, 53-57.

Ruebush, B. K. Anxiety. In Stevenson, H. W., Hagan, J., & Spiker, C. (Eds.), Child psychology: 62nd N.S.S.E. yearbook, 1963, pp. 460-516.

Sarason, S. B., Lighthall, F. F., Davidson, K. S., Waite, R. R., & Ruebush, B. K. Anxiety in elementary school children. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston: Row, Peterson, & Co., 1957.

Sundberg, N. D. The practice of psychological testing in clinical services in the United States. Amer. Psychol., 1961, 16, 79-83.

Taylor, Janet A. A personality scale of manifest anxiety. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1953, 48, 285-290.

Ullman, C. Identification of maladjusted school children. Monograph No. 7, Washington, D. C.: U.S. Public Health Service, 1961.

Veroff, J., Wilcox, Sue, & Atkinson, J. W. The achievement motive in high school and college age women. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1953, 48, 108-119.

Wickman, E. K. Children's behavior and teachers' attitudes. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

APPENDIX A

Correlation Matrix

List of Variables

1. Age
2. Number of Siblings
3. Number of Older Siblings
4. Mother's Education
5. Father's Education
6. Positive Affect for School
7. Pupil's School Achievement Orientation
8. Degree of Classroom Individualized Instruction
9. Perceived Difficulty of Work - Pupil Report
10. Interpersonal Affect in Classroom
11. Perception of Teacher as Supportive
12. Pupil Test Anxiety
13. General School Anxiety
14. Recitation Anxiety
15. Verbal IQ
16. Non-verbal IQ
17. Goodenough IQ
18. Size of Goodenough Drawing
19. Embellishment on Goodenough Drawing
20. Action in Goodenough Drawing
21. Erasure in Goodenough Drawing
22. Hostility in Goodenough Drawing
23. Teacher Rating of Pupil Achievement
24. Pupil Peer Ratings - Total
25. Class Play Rating - Total of #2 Ratings
26. Class Play Rating - Percentage of Peer Negative Ratings
27. Total TASC
28. Sex
29. Reading Comprehension
30. Arithmetic

Correlation Coefficients

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	1.00														
2	.24	1.00													
3	.13	.57	1.00												
4	-.07	.09	-.03	1.00											
5	-.00	.12	-.05	.42	1.00										
6	.19	-.05	-.14	.21	.11	1.00									
7	.13	.03	.08	.10	.10	.29	1.00								
8	.16	.11	.05	-.09	-.13	.21	-.03	1.00							
9	-.16	-.11	-.06	-.21	-.01	-.49	-.17	.06	1.00						
10	.14	.12	.19	.16	-.01	.36	.37	.32	-.17	1.00					
11	.26	.11	.01	.24	.02	.50	.37	.41	-.26	.62	1.00				
12	-.28	-.08	.06	.05	-.10	-.27	.10	-.09	.28	-.14	-.23	1.00			
13	-.16	.13	.10	-.04	-.05	-.33	-.02	-.15	.40	-.16	-.33	.51	1.00		
14	-.10	.04	.00	-.02	-.13	-.42	-.17	-.16	.43	-.15	-.35	.59	.69	1.00	
15	-.24	-.22	-.24	.20	.21	.15	-.00	-.14	.02	-.06	.04	-.09	-.25	-.07	1.00
16	-.01	-.04	-.10	.10	.09	.08	.12	-.07	-.12	.03	.02	.03	-.21	-.05	.64
17	-.24	-.10	-.05	.09	.08	.04	.12	-.07	-.15	.07	.11	-.02	-.16	-.17	.32
18	-.10	-.11	.07	-.08	-.19	-.10	.06	-.18	.00	-.04	.05	.10	.15	.05	-.02
19	-.24	.05	.10	.05	.08	-.22	-.11	-.10	-.01	-.08	-.21	.14	.34	.17	-.08
20	-.03	-.11	-.11	-.02	.05	-.08	-.11	-.07	.08	-.01	-.19	-.01	.07	.11	.11
21	.04	.01	.01	.02	.02	-.01	-.03	.27	.12	.16	.07	.05	-.03	-.01	-.04
22	.04	-.09	-.11	-.06	-.08	-.23	-.04	-.03	-.07	.04	-.09	.03	.16	.24	-.16
23	-.19	.04	.08	-.01	-.12	-.08	-.09	.14	.15	-.23	-.27	.08	.20	.11	-.19
24	.03	.01	.07	-.03	.08	.24	.05	-.16	-.30	-.12	.06	-.12	-.33	-.23	.22
25	-.15	-.13	-.04	-.03	.05	-.22	.07	.04	.23	-.14	-.17	.20	.04	.11	.00
26	-.10	.06	.19	-.09	-.26	-.16	-.10	.06	.17	-.29	-.30	.14	.18	.12	-.06
27	-.22	.02	.05	.02	-.08	-.37	-.01	-.17	.41	-.19	-.34	.86	.83	.85	-.14
28	-.11	-.16	-.10	.10	-.13	.05	-.01	.05	.03	.01	.17	.15	-.01	-.00	.05
29	.30	.01	-.09	.19	.21	.21	.14	-.04	-.15	.00	.18	-.15	-.30	-.13	.65
30	.51	.06	-.09	.13	.25	.17	.05	-.00	-.06	.04	.19	-.22	-.29	-.10	.46

N = 40

$p(r) \leq .31 = .05$

$p(r) \leq .40 = .01$

Correlation Coefficients

Variable	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
16	1.00												
17	.17	1.00											
18	-.04	.18	1.00										
19	.02	.17	-.06	1.00									
20	.19	.36	.06	.37	1.00								
21	-.09	-.15	-.07	-.17	-.11	1.00							
22	-.08	.19	-.02	.34	.45	.09	1.00						
23	-.27	-.15	-.03	-.05	-.19	.10	.02	1.00					
24	.20	.14	.01	-.05	-.05	-.16	-.17	-.13	1.00				
25	.05	-.10	-.15	-.03	-.19	.06	-.16	.18	.06	1.00			
26	-.05	-.11	-.01	.09	-.05	.10	.01	.60	-.03	.30	1.00		
27	-.05	-.12	.12	.23	.06	.00	.15	.16	-.24	.15	.17	1.00	
28	-.07	-.09	.07	-.07	-.21	.04	-.26	-.02	-.16	.13	-.08	.06	1.00
29	.57	.20	-.05	-.14	.08	-.06	-.13	-.29	.23	-.02	-.11	-.21	.03
30	.49	-.05	-.05	-.26	-.00	.07	-.13	-.38	.19	-.01	-.23	-.23	.00

N = 40

$p(r) \leq .31 = .05$

$p(r) \leq .40 = .01$

APPENDIX B

Instrumentation

Midwest Research Center for Pupil Personnel Services

The School Mental Health Project

Pupil Attitudes Toward School

Questions for Grades 3 through 12

My name is_____and I shall be asking you some questions today. The questions have no right or wrong answers because they ask you what you think of school and how you get along in school and what you do in school; and questions like that never have any right or wrong answers. I am asking you these questions because I think they may help us learn how to make school a better place to be. Just give the answer that is most nearly the way you feel. No one but research people at the University will ever see your answers. No one who knows you, not even your teachers, your parents, or your principal, will ever know how you answered any specific question. After these questionnaires are taken to the University, your name will be removed from the answer sheets and all that will be left is a number. Then a machine will read and tabulate your answers. Thus, only the machine will ever know how you answered any particular question. The machine will give us the information that will help us understand how you and your other classmates react to school.

O.K., then, now let's look at the instructions.

Instructions

This questionnaire is simply a list of questions that I will read out loud. Follow along with me. Then, after I have read the questions, I will read a number of possible answers. You pick the answer that is most nearly the way you would like to answer the question. Then indicate the answer you picked on the answer sheet. Notice that the answers are numbered 1 to 5. If you wanted to give answer #1 you would mark space #1 on your answer sheet like this. See the example.

1	2	3	4	5
▮	//	//	//	//

See the way the answer is marked. Be sure to mark the answer clearly. Do not make any extra marks on the paper. If you wish to change your answer, be sure you erase your first mark completely. Now let's take a practice question. Listen while I read the question. "How often do you like ice cream?" Now here are the answers. Number 1 says <u>never</u>; number 2 says <u>seldom</u>; number 3 says <u>sometimes</u>; number 4 says <u>most of the time</u>; number 5 says <u>almost always</u>. Which do you think you would like to put as your answer? I think I like ice cream <u>most of the time</u> so I would mark answer number 4.

1	2	3	4	5
//	//	//	▮	//

When we start on the next page, please do not skip any questions. Be sure you answer each and every question as it is read to you. I will always give you enough time to make up your mind.

O.K., now let's turn the page and begin. Let's look at number 1. Number 1 says.....

PART I

Answer Key:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Most of the Time	Almost Always

1. How often do you think the work you do in school is interesting?

2. How frequently does the teacher say things that confuse you or mix you up?

3. How often are you allowed to sit where you choose?

4. How often do you really buckle down and do serious work in school?

5. It is _____ important to get the best grades one can.

6. How often do you really want to do the work in school?

7. How often does the teacher explain things so fast that the pupils have a hard time understanding?

8. How often does the teacher tell you how important it is to study hard?

9. The teacher _____ gives special help to those who need it.

10. It is _____ more important to get good grades than to participate in extra school activities.

11. If you are having trouble with your work, how often would your teacher help you?

12. How often does your teacher teach small groups instead of the whole class at one time?

13. How often do you like your school work?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Most of the Time	Almost Always

14. How often do pupils each have different assignments to do?

15. How often do you think students wish the teacher would go slower when explaining things?

16. How often do you get more interested in your school work after you once get started.

17. How much of the time can you choose things that just you, yourself, will do in school?

18. How often do you get mixed up trying to follow what the teacher is telling you to do?

19. The things we learn in school are _____ interesting.

20. How often are some students allowed to work ahead of the others?

21. How often is your school work so hard that you have trouble doing it?

22. How often does the teacher let you pick the work assignment you want to do?

23. How often does your teacher teach you about so many different things that you have a hard time remembering them all?

****

Wait here. Do not turn the page until you are told to do so.

PART II

24. Most of the time my school work is:

1. Much too easy
2. Quite easy
3. Just about right
4. Quite hard
5. Much too hard

25. I like _____ of my classmates.

1. Almost none
2. A few
3. Some
4. Most
5. Almost all

26. How much do teachers remind you of people who scold?

1. A whole lot
2. Quite a bit
3. Some
4. Just a little bit
5. Not very much

27. Sometimes people are friendly and sometimes they are not. How friendly are your classmates to you?

1. No one is friendly
2. They are a little friendly
3. They are friendly sometimes
4. They are quite friendly
5. They are very friendly

28. How much does school remind you of a place where people talk to each other in a friendly way?

1. Not at all
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

29. How much do teachers remind you of people who get angry?

    1. A whole lot
    2. Quite a bit
    3. Some
    4. Just a little bit
    5. Not at all

30. How many of your classmates feel that pupils should always try to get the best grades they can?

    1. Almost none
    2. Only a few
    3. Some
    4. A lot
    5. Almost all

31. School work in this class is:

    1. Always very easy to do
    2. Usually easy
    3. About right, I can do it if I want to
    4. Usually hard to do
    5. Always very hard to do

32. How much does school remind you of a place where you have friends?

    1. Almost none
    2. Just a little bit
    3. Some
    4. Quite a bit
    5. A whole lot

33. How many of your classmates feel that pupils should do everything teachers ask?

    1. Almost none
    2. Only a few
    3. Some
    4. A lot
    5. Almost all

34. How much do teachers remind you of people who pick on you?

    1. A whole lot
    2. Quite a bit
    3. Some
    4. Just a little bit
    5. Almost none

35. How much does school remind you of a place where people are treated fairly?

1. Not at all
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

36. How many of your classmates feel that pupils should ask a teacher for help when they do not understand something?

1. Almost none
2. Only a few
3. Some
4. A lot
5. Almost all

37. How much does school remind you of a place where people try to help each other?

1. Almost none
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

38. How many of your classmates feel that it is all right to really like teachers?

1. Almost none
2. A few
3. Some
4. A lot
5. Almost all

39. How much do teachers remind you of people who criticize?

1. A whole lot
2. Quite a bit
3. Some
4. Just a little bit
5. Not at all

40. How much does school remind you of a place that makes you feel happy?

1. About none
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

41. How many of your classmates feel that it is more important for students to learn their lessons than to be friendly with each other?

1. Almost none
2. Only a few
3. Some
4. A lot
5. Almost all

42. How much do teachers remind you of people who like to help?

1. None
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

43. Of all the friends I have _____ are in my class.

1. Hardly any
2. Only a few
3. Some
4. Most
5. Almost all

44. How much do teachers remind you of someone you like to talk to when you are unhappy?

1. Almost none
2. Just a little bit
3. Some
4. Quite a bit
5. A whole lot

45. If I had my way, I would:

    1. Quit school today
    2. Quit when I can
    3. Go to school for a little more
    4. Go to school for quite a bit longer
    5. Go to school for as long as I can

46. How much do teachers remind you of people who make you feel important?

    1. Almost none
    2. Just a little bit
    3. Some
    4. Quite a bit
    5. A whole lot

47. School is a place I like to be at:

    1. Not at all
    2. Just a little
    3. Some
    4. Quite a lot
    5. A whole lot

48. How much do teachers remind you of people who upset you?

    1. A whole lot
    2. Quite a lot
    3. Some
    4. Just a little
    5. Not at all

****

PART III

Answer Key:

1	2	3	4	5
None	Just a little	Some	Quite a bit	A whole lot

49. How much do you worry when the teacher says that she is going to ask you questions to find out how much you know about the lesson?

50. When the teacher says that she is going to call on someone to recite, how much do you hope she will call on someone else?

51. How much do you dream at night you are in school and cannot answer the teacher's question?

52. When you think you are going to be called on by the teacher, how often does your heart begin to beat faster?

53. When you are home at night, how often do you worry about how good you will do in class the next day?

54. When the teacher asks you to write on the blackboard in front of the class, how much does the hand you write with shake?

55. How much do you worry about school?

56. When you are at home and you are thinking about your school work for the next day, how afraid are you that you will get the answers wrong when the teacher calls on you?

57. How much do you dream at night that others in your class can do things you cannot do?

58. When you are home and thinking about your classwork for the next day, how often do you worry you will do poorly on the classwork?

Answer Key:

1	2	3	4	5
None	Just a little	Some	Quite a bit	A whole lot

59. When you think you are going to be called on by the teacher, how often do you get a funny feeling in your stomach?

60. If you did very poorly when the teacher called on you, how much did it bother you and make you feel unhappy?

61. How often do you dream at night that the teacher is angry because you do not know your lessons?

62. How afraid are you of school tests?

63. How much do you worry before you take a test?

64. How much do you worry while you are taking a test?

65. After you have taken a test, how much do you worry about how well you did on the test?

66. How often do you dream at night that you did poorly on a test you had in school that day?

67. When you are taking a test, how much does the hand you write with shake?

68. When your teacher says that she is going to give the class a test, how afraid are you that you will do poorly?

69. When you are taking a difficult test, how often do you forget some things you knew well before you started taking the test?

70. How often do you ever wish that you didn't worry so much about tests?

71. When the teacher says she is going to give the class a test, how nervous do you get?

72. While you are taking a test, how often do you usually think you are doing poorly?